

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

FETCH MEDIA, LTD.,

Plaintiff,

v.

UBER TECHNOLOGIES, INC.,

Defendant.

No. C 18-00015 WHA


**ORDER DENYING
ADMINISTRATIVE MOTION TO
FILE UNDER SEAL**

Our analysis begins with a “strong presumption” in favor of access to court records. *Foltz v. State Farm Mutual Automobile Insurance Company*, 331 F.3d 1122, 1135 (9th Cir. 2003). When the “good cause” standard applies there must be a “particularized showing” that specific harm or prejudice will result if the information is disclosed. *Kamakana v. City & County of Honolulu*, 447 F.3d 1172, 1179–80 (9th Cir. 2006). Furthermore, Civil Local Rule 79-5(b) requires administrative motions to file under seal to “be narrowly tailored to seek sealing only of sealable material.” Here, no good cause has been shown to seal all of Exhibits A through F to the complaint. Accordingly, plaintiff’s overbroad sealing motion is **DENIED**.

Plaintiff may file a renewed administrative motion to file under seal by **JULY 2 AT NOON**. If the renewed motion is not narrowly tailored, it will be denied in its entirety.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: June 27, 2018.



WILLIAM ALSUP
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE